



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

160, δ 173, ε 128, 132, 304, 409, η 250 ι, 67, μ 313, 415, ξ 235, 305, 457, φ 413, ω 42, 539. The first book of the *Odyssey* in which the actor is away from home and out in the open is ε, and in no part of the *Iliad* does Zeus appear more frequently as wielding the lightning and the storm; and this is true of all the out-of-door scenes of the *Odyssey*.

The less frequent references to the phenomena of the heaven do not show any "less sensibility to natural phenomena" but do show that storms, clouds, and the sky mean more to men living in camps or the field than they do to the inhabitants of towns. It is only when men are out in the open that they point to the stars. Homer was too familiar with this trait to ignore it in his poetry. Had there been as many references to the sky, the stars, and the heavens in the *Odyssey* as in the *Iliad*, when their setting is so different, then we might have a real *Chorizontic Argument*.

However, there is one chorizontic argument of the most far-reaching importance which has thus far escaped attention, namely, the *Iliad* refers to beans, *κίαμοι*, the *Odyssey* does not. Why this silence? The poet of the *Odyssey* knew beans, and his silence must have been due to some ceremonial scruple, some religious taboo. Where was such a taboo on beans? Not at Athens, for the officials were chosen by beans. Lucian tells us that in Athens all the officials were thus chosen, and Herodotus, Thucydides, as well as Aristophanes, point in the same direction.

We must turn from Athens in our search for the land of this taboo on beans, and our trail leads straight to the school of Pythagoras and its motto: *κνιάμων ἀπέχεσθαι*. These are words to ponder over, for this gives us a definite clue to the date and land of the *Odyssey*.

I am baffled by a second discovery. The poet of the *Odyssey* refers to birds and poultry, but he never mentions eggs. Whither does this point us? Like Wilamowitz in his *Hom. Untersuchungen*, I can only say, "Das führt uns weiter und weiter, weg von Ithaka und den Abenteuern des Meeres, von dem irdischen and heroischen weg, hinauf, hinauf zu den Göttern."

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

XENOPHON *Anabasis* i. 8. 13

In reading lately once more Xenophon's *Anabasis* i. 8. 13, in the edition of Professor A. T. Murray (1914), I came upon an interpretation of two participles to which I have long taken exception. The passage runs as follows: *ὄρων δὲ ὁ Κλέαρχος τὸ μέσον στῖφος καὶ ἀκούων Κύρου ξέω ὄντα τοῦ εὐωνύμου βασιλεία, τοσοῦτον γὰρ πληθεῖ περιῆν βασιλεὺς ὥστε μέσον τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔχων τοῦ Κύρου εὐωνύμου ξέω ἦν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ Κλέαρχος οὐκ ἤθελεν ἀποσπᾶσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὸ δεξιὸν κέρασ, φοβούμενος μὴ κυκλωθεῖη ἐκατέρωθεν, κ.τ.λ.*

Professor Murray has this note: "*ὄρων*, although he saw; so *ἀκούων*, below." Similar comments on *ὄρων*, making the participle equivalent to a concessive

(adversative) clause, may be found in the editions of Macmichael and Melhuish (1888), Kelsey and Zenos (1891), Goodwin and White (1896), and Mather and Hewitt (1910). Into German editions I have not thought it worth while to look. It is enough and more than enough that an explanation so palpably false has found its way into editions by thoroughly competent American scholars, editions, too, that have been most in use in America. I say the interpretation is palpably false, because one has only to translate the whole passage to see that *ὁρῶν* and *ἀκούων* cannot be concessive (adversative). Would it be sensible to say the following? "*Though Klearchos saw the compact mass in the center, and though he heard from Cyrus that the king was beyond his left wing [i.e., though he heard from Cyrus that the king far outnumbered him, and so was in position to outflank him and the whole force of Cyrus—a movement the Greeks manifestly dreaded, as we see in part from the fact that originally they drew up their line of battle with the Euphrates on their right flank, and later, according to i. 10. 9, purposed to put the river behind them], he was nevertheless unwilling to withdraw the wing from the river, fearing that he might be surrounded.*"

To say that would be as sensible as to say "he was unwilling to withdraw the wing from the river, though he feared that he might be surrounded."

No, *ὁρῶν*, *ἀκούων*, and *φοβούμενος* are all alike causal rather than adversative in connotation.

How, then, did competent scholars make the mistake of taking either or both of the first two of these participles as concessive (adversative) in connotation? They were mislead by *ὅμως* in *ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ Κλέαρχος οὐκ ᾔθελεν*, κ.τ.λ., and by their punctuation of the text, i.e., by the fact that they had set off *τοσοῦτον γὰρ . . . ἔξω ἦν* by dashes, as parenthetical.

Now, in fact, *ὅμως* is in opposition, not at all to the ideas contained in *ὁρῶν* and *ἀκούων*, but to the idea contained in the participle *ἔχων*, which stands in the (so-called) parenthesis. The quasi-parenthetical sentence can, of course, mean only one thing: "for so marked was the numerical superiority of the king's forces that, *though he commanded the center [only] of his army, he was nevertheless beyond* the left wing of Cyrus' whole force." Should anyone doubt this, he should be convinced by *Anabasis* i. 8. 23: *καὶ βασιλεὺς δὴ τότε μέσον ἔχων τῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιάς ὅμως ἔξω ἐγένετο τοῦ Κύρου εὐωνύμου κέρατος*.

Now, if what has been said above is right, the introduction of *ὅμως* into the passage after the resumptive *ἀλλ'* is a logical flaw, since, to repeat, *ὅμως* is in opposition, not to anything in the main proposition, with which we are now by virtue of the position of *ὅμως* again dealing, but to something in a subordinate proposition. This logical flaw is made worse if we set off, as some do, *τοσοῦτον γὰρ . . . ἔξω ἦν* by dashes.

One may be glad, however, that Xenophon was guilty of the logical flaw, for his introduction of *ὅμως* at the point where he in fact set it teaches some important lessons. First, it shows how sensitive Xenophon was, and we may,

no doubt, add, the Greeks in general were, to the varying shades of meaning, to what some call the *nuances*, of the participle (here ἔχων). Secondly, we see that clauses which we incline to regard as parenthetical, or as of the nature of footnotes, were, after all, to the Greek closely knit into the fabric of his paragraph. I am reminded here of my deep-rooted objection to the growing tendency, in modern editions of Latin authors, to point with a period before *nam*-clauses. As I have elsewhere remarked, the Greeks and the Romans thought and wrote in longer sentences than are now current in English; they thought and read in the large, not in snippets, as we do. Lastly, we have all noted, unhappily many times, that, if an editor of a Greek or a Latin classic made it his unvarying practice to translate his author in full as part of his preparation for his editorial labors, commentaries on the classics would lack many a blemish by which they are now marred. One who tries to translate our passage will find, if he has a grasp of its real logic, that he must not translate ὅμως at all.

CHARLES KNAPP

BARNARD COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY